DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 396 765 IR 055 938

AUTHOR Lorenzen, Michael G.
TITLE Security Issues of Academic Libraries.
PUB DATE Jun 96
NOTE 56p.; Master's Seminar Paper, Ohio University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Books; Costs; Higher Education; *Library Collections; Library Instruction; *Library Personnel; Periodicals; Problems; School Security; School Vandalism; Stealing; *Users (Information)
IDENTIFIERS Book Losses; Book Mutilation; *Library Security

ABSTRACT

This study examines and evaluates security issues in academic libraries and examines how educators in institutions of higher learning deal with them. Security issues include: the theft of library materials, the mutilation or vandalism of library materials, dealing with deranged and/or disruptive patrons, and assaults on library patrons and staff. The purpose of the study is to develop an integrated approach to dealing with security issues of academic libraries. This is significant in a time when higher education is being forced to contain costs. Replacing missing and mutilated library items is expensive as is dealing with lawsuits resulting from victims of criminal activity in libraries. While there are multiple causes for security problems, studies have shown that most mutilation and theft is done by patrons who do not understand replacement costs, do not care about the needs of others, and do not know they are committing a crime when they mutilate or steal from the library. Various authors have urged educating this type of patron to cut down on security problems. Library staff cause some problems by not knowing what security problems are and how to deal with them. They also do not always enforce the rules consistently, which may make security problems worse. Librarians are taking steps to deal with security issues by installing electronic security systems, addressing areas such as building design, using identification cards, and educating patrons. (Contains 64 references.) (Author/SWC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 396 765

SECURITY ISSUES OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

A Seminar Paper Presented to
The Faculty of the College of Education
Ohio University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Education

by
Michael G. Lorenzen
June, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Lorenzen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR055938

This seminar paper has been approved

for the School of Applied Behavioral Sciences

and Educational Leadership and

the College of Education

by

Miland Brown

Assistant Professor, School of Applied Behavioral Sciences

and Educational Leadership

Audra Kerik

Director, School of Applied Behavioral Sciences

and Educational Leadership

DEDICATION

I dedicate this seminar paper to my wife, Julie Lorenzen. I appreciate her understanding and patience with me through the time it has taken to earn this degree. With her love, all things are possible.

I also dedicate this paper to my parents, Gary and Kiplyn Lorenzen. Their financial support allowed me to earn my Master's Degree in Library Science which resulted in me getting my job with Ohio University. As I earned this second master's on fee waivers, this degree is also a result of their generosity since the fee waivers were dependent on my employment with Ohio University.

Further, I dedicate this paper to Dr. Frances Pearson. Without her help, this paper would not have been possible. Dr. Pearson is one of the strengths of the Ohio University College of Education. Her coming departure from the College of Education is indeed a major loss to Ohio University.

Finally, I dedicate this seminar paper to my cat Simba. Many times over the last several years, I have sat at my computer with a beer in one hand and a kitten purring on my lap typing desperately at the last minute to finish yet another paper. Without the unconditional love of my kitten, academic success seems somewhat hollow. Every graduate student needs a cat.

Table of Contents

Page

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Background of the Study 1

Statement of the Problem 3

Research Questions 3

Purpose of the Study 3

Delimitations 4

Limitations 4

Definition of Terms 4

Methodology 5

Organization of the Study 6

Chapter Two: Review of the Literature 8

Introduction 8

Security Issues in Academic Libraries 8

Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries 12

Responses to Security issues in Academic Libraries .17

Summary 23

Chapter Three: Analysis of the Literature 24

Introduction 24

Security Issues in Academic Libraries 24

Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries 29

Responses to Security Issues in Academic Libraries .33

Chapter Four: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations .38

Introduction 38

Summary 38

Conclusions 41

Recommendations 42

References 44

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background

The academic campus is not always a safe and secure place. Violence and property crime can and do occur. Academic libraries are no exception and they are subject to a wide variety of security concerns. There are many potential problems in security that an academic library face.

Theft of library material is an ancient problem. The looting of the Great Library in Alexandria by soldiers of the Prophet in the Seventh Century is the first recorded example. Stuart (1988) did a historical study on Europe dealing with book theft. The study focused on Dr. Pilcher, a well known scholar, who also stole extensively from the Imperial Russian Library in the 19th Century. Stuart also studied some earlier book thieves as well. Seleth (1991) also reported on a historical book thief. Not surprisingly due to all the Nigerian research on this topic, Lincoln and Lincoln (1986) showed that theft and mutilation were an international problem as well as a historical one.

As public institutions, public libraries have encountered many of the problems that exist in today's society. The criminal use of public libraries (Anderson, 1986), the theft of public library materials (Gothberg, 1987), and obnoxious patron behavior (Lincoln, 1984) have

all been thoroughly documented. Thus, it can be surmised that some of these same problems exist in academic libraries.

Many academic libraries are under state control and are required to provide access to the general public. Private institutions of higher education usually do not prevent the general public from entering their library collections. According to Brand (1980), academic libraries are vulnerable to security risks from the public population. Further, members of the academic community, both students and faculty/staff, can pose security problems.

Security issues in academic libraries are numerous. These include: the theft of library materials, the mutilation or vandalism of library materials, dealing with deranged and/or disruptive patrons, and assaults on library patrons and staff. Institutions of higher education spend millions of dollars to build library book and periodical collections. Patrons can do considerable damage to these collections by stealing from them or mutilating items in the collection. Patrons can also disrupt the library environment by harassing patrons and staff or committing illegal acts (Lorenzen, 1993).

Academic libraries have responded in many ways to these threats to the collection and to the people who use and work in the library. Increased training of staff to deal with these issues has been one way. Increasing the presence of

security personnel in the library has been another. By far the biggest response has been the installation of electronic security devices to prevent the unauthorized circulation of library materials (Olsen & Ostler, 1985).

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to examine and evaluate the different security issues that academic libraries deal with and examine how different institutions of higher education are dealing with them.

Research Questions

The following research questions are developed to ascertain and examine the problem of security issues in academic libraries:

1) What type of security problems exist in the libraries of institutions of higher education?
2) What are the causes of the security problems in the libraries of the institutions of higher education?
3) How are libraries of institutions of higher education dealing with the security problems?

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop an integrated approach to dealing with security issues of academic libraries. These issues are diverse and difficult to deal with. However, this study will attempt to provide valuable

insight into security issues for academic libraries so that educators working in higher education and libraries will be better able to deal with these issues. This has great significance in a time when higher education is being forced to contain costs. Replacing missing and mutilated library items is expensive as is dealing with lawsuits resulting from victims of criminal activity in libraries.

Delimitations

The scope of this study incorporates research studies that use empirical research. However, analysis of methods and procedures used in these studies is only going to be briefly touched on if it is mentioned at all. Rather, results and a discussion of these results will be included.

Much of the research done on the topic of library security issues has been done focusing on public libraries. This study will at times refer to some of this research. However, this study is concentrating on higher education and no attempt is being made to include a comprehensive or even extensive listing on research dealing with public library security.

Limitations

This limitation of this study is that research in academic library security first began in the 1970's. Therefore, the research base is limited to the last several decades. Security issues have always existed in the libraries of institutions of higher education but only

recently has the importance of doing research in this area been recognized.

Definition of Terms

The study defines some critical terminology that is associated with academic library security issues:

Academic library. The library of any educational institution that operates at the post-secondary level.

Disruptive Behavior. Any activity on the part of a patron that interferes with the educational mission of the library. This behavior is not always illegal.

Electronic Security System. Any method of preventing the unauthorized circulation of library materials that relies on mechanical devices that detect when unauthorized library materials are being removed from the library.

Mutilation of Library Materials. The deliberate cutting up or vandalism of an item in the library collection. This can mean the cutting up of material to remove part of it from the library collection. It can also mean vandalism of library materials so that other may not use the material or the defacing of such material to make a statement.

Plating. The theft of valuable plates from old maps and atlases.

Security Problems. Any activity that the educators that administer or work in library consider to be inappropriate activity. This includes any violation of the law as well as

activities that are not illegal but are found to be disruptive to the academic library environment.

Theft of Library Materials. The unauthorized circulation of any material in the library.

Methodology

Articles cited in this study were retrieved from either the index Library Literature or ERIC. Subject headings searched under included library security, mutilation of library materials, theft of library materials, disruptive patrons, and crime in libraries. A search was done in the central catalog of OhioLINK on the appropriate subjects as well. All research was conducted at the Zanesville Campus Library of Ohio University and the Muskingum Area Technical College.

Organization of the Study

The study begins with Chapter One and describes the topic of security issues in academic libraries. More specifically, Chapter One which introduces the study includes: background, statement of the problem, research questions, purpose of the study, delimitations, limitations, definition of terms, methodology of the study and organization of the study. Next, Chapter Two reviews the literature of security issues in academic libraries. Using the same headings as Chapter Two, Chapter Three analyzes the literature review to give educators in academic libraries strategies to deal with security issues. Finally, the study

is summarized, conclusions are drawn and recommendations are proposed that include further investigation suggestions and recommendations for practice.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Introduction

Chapter One dealt with the problem of the study which is the security issues facing academic libraries. Chapter Two contains a review of the literature organized into the following headings; Security Issues in Academic Libraries, Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries, and Responses to Security Issues in Academic Libraries. An analyses of this literature will be done in Chapter Three.

Research on academic library security tends to focus on three areas. The first is, who causes the security problems in academic libraries? Researchers have looked at patrons, staff, faculty, and institutional outsiders in this regard. The second is, what type of security problems do people cause in academic libraries? This type of research runs from studies of violent crime to disruptive patrons. The third is, what is the method of preventing security problems from occurring? These types of studies look at staff training, electronic security systems, and the concept of closed stacks. Many researchers have looked at more than one area in their studies.

Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

Hendrick and Murfin (1974) theorized that academic libraries were the most vulnerable kind of library to

periodical mutilation. They studied a large academic research library to determine its periodical mutilation rate and they discovered that the library had a mutilation rate of 9% for periodicals. That was a drop of 23% from a previous study of the same library. Between the studies, an electronic security system had been installed. It was concluded that the security system was having an influence on patron mutilation activity.

Lorenzen (1993) did a study of over 100 academic libraries in Ohio to determine the extent of security problems. He discovered that the periodical mutilation rate for the state was only 2.33%. However, the rate was higher for university libraries and 62.5% of university libraries considered periodical mutilation to be a large threat to the library collection. In contrast, not a single seminary library in the state considered this a problem.

Book mutilation was reported by Taylor (1981). He was disturbed by the high incidence of book mutilation and vandalism. In particular, he was concerned by the prevalence of underlining and highlighting in library books and by the editorial comments that also were appearing in library books. He compared this damage to putting scratches on a record. Roberts (1984) reported the same problems, concentrating on book abuse as it related to bookmarks. Interestingly, Roberts believed that the lack of bookmarks can lead to book mutilation.

Theft

The special collections of libraries are vulnerable to theft and mutilation. Valuable and irreplaceable materials are usually stored in these collections. As such, these collections are vulnerable to theft from professional thieves. Otness and Otness (1988) looked at the problem of the theft of older maps from libraries. The two described what they called going plating which was the theft of valuable plates from old maps and atlases. Several steps were listed to frustrate thieves. It was speculated that most of the theft of plates was done by professional thieves. Ragains (1991) also reported on this problem.

Bahr (1989) concentrated on internal theft from a library. Not all theft is perpetuated by patrons. Some library employees take material from the library without properly circulating it. As library employees know how to defeat the security system, this is, according to Bahr, one of the hardest types of theft to prevent.

O'Neill and Boomgaarden (1995) reported on book deterioration and loss in Ohio libraries. It was discovered that nearly 12% of books in 100 Ohio libraries were missing. This compared with a little more than 3% that were unusable due to deterioration. Therefore, it appeared that book theft was a bigger problem for libraries than book deterioration.

People

Patrons can also cause security problems by their behavior in the library, even if they are not mutilating or stealing. Brashear, Malone & Thorton-Jaringe (1981) conducted a study of all of the libraries in the state of Illinois. They discovered widespread problems with patrons acting inappropriately. They also found that public libraries have more problems with this issue than do academic libraries.

Grof (1984) focused on the problem of the difficult patron. He discussed several types of difficult patrons including ones who were drunk, addicted to drugs, mentally disturbed, or were juveniles without supervision. Grof suggested placing the emphasis on the denial of rights to patrons using the library without disruption rather than the denial of rights to the difficult patron.

Delph (1980) wrote a paper on preventing public sex in the academic library setting. Delph was concerned about the tendency of certain groups (community patrons, using the library for homosexual acts, and students) to use library facilities to engage in sexual activities. He called for an awareness of sexual activities in libraries. It was argued that patterns occur in libraries and that librarians can predict when and where sexual activity is likely to occur (i.e. in the evening in the fourth floor restrooms, etc.) By patrolling these places and times, and by letting

suspicious patrons know they are being watched, librarians can make the library an unappealing location for sexual activity.

Elliott (1982) wrote about the types of patrons who can cause problems. This list included those with mental problems such as the schizophrenic, the paranoid, and the alcoholic. She also noted criminal types such as exhibitionists, voyeurs, and child molesters. Further, Elliott considered other potentially disturbed patrons such as the elderly, children, and angry people.

Anderson (1986) focused on the situation of a single patron who makes it difficult for librarians to do their jobs without specifically doing anything illegal. The case highlighted dealt with a patron who followed librarians around at all times including when other patrons were being helped, talking about nothing, making it difficult for the librarians to do their jobs.

Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

Hendrick and Murfin (1974) distributed a questionnaire at Kent State University to discover why students mutilated periodicals. It was discovered that mutilators had a less favorable attitude towards the library than non-mutilators. The two concluded that publicity about the crime of mutilation was probably the answer to the problem. Hendrick

and Murfin (1975) published the same research with the same conclusions a year later.

Weiss (1981) looked at why students steal and mutilate books and periodicals. A questionnaire was distributed to students at a large urban university library. It was discovered that pressure to succeed in a high pressure academic environment seemed to motivate most theft and mutilation.

Pederson (1990) studied student perceptions of theft and mutilation. He administered a survey to students at Emporia State University in Kansas. It was learned that several assumptions about the causes of periodical and book mutilation were true: (1) Student dissatisfaction or unfamiliarity with library services can result in theft and mutilation; (2) A lack of knowledge about material replacement costs and time can add to the problem; (3) A lack of concern for the needs of others often prevents students from refraining from damaging collections; (4) Few students even think of library theft and mutilation as a crime.

Collver (1990) examined the rate of periodical mutilation in academic libraries in relation to student numbers. Since 1975, the State University of New York Stony Brook Library has collected a "ripoff file" of copies of articles that readers have reported missing from the bound volumes of periodicals in the general, humanities, and

social sciences area. The 1978-87 records showed that 9% of articles had been stolen. Collver found that articles in the humanities are the least likely to be ripped-off. Psychology articles in the social science area are the most likely to be stolen. It was found that mutilation rates in a subject area can be positively predicted from the number of students enrolled in related programs.

Schumm (1992) did a study of the kinds of periodicals most likely to be mutilated. He examined the levels and patterns of periodical mutilation at three university libraries located in Texas. A page by page examination of seven popular and seven scholarly periodicals from 1981 to 1988 was done. Schumm found that a greater proportion of popular periodicals were mutilated. This indicates that undergraduate students were the main source of theft as faculty and graduate students rely more on scholarly journals. Schumm (1994) followed this study up two years later and found similar results the second time.

Theft

Okoye-Ikonta (1981) researched the incidences of book theft and book mutilation in thirteen Nigerian academic libraries. It was concluded that there was a high rate of book theft and book mutilation in Nigerian academic libraries. Interestingly, Olorunsola (1987) followed up on academic security concerns in Nigerian academic libraries. He examined crimes at Ilorin University including book theft

and book mutilation. Olorunsola discovered a relationship between high rates of security problems and the growth of Ilorin University. He concluded that rapid growth in the size of a university and the size of a library collection will result in a sharp increase in security problems.

Watstein (1983) looked at book mutilation and book theft and their relationship to electronic security systems. She conducted a survey of academic libraries to determine if mutilation rates go up after an electronic security system is installed. This was discovered to be true. Watstein stated that patrons are more apt to mutilate a book or periodical in order to get what they need rather than chance setting off the electronic security system by taking the entire book or periodical. As typically only one security strip is placed in each item, this strategy is successful in defeating the electronic security system most of the time. Because of this, theft will go down but Watstein concluded mutilation rates will rise in a library after an electronic security system is installed.

People

Sheridan (1980) looked at how library personnel can influence library security. Sheridan believed that untrained library staff were responsible for many of the library security problems. Staff unfamiliar with proper security techniques and policies make it easy for security problems to exist and they alienate patrons engaged in

appropriate behavior. Sheridan concluded that library staff should be given extensive security training.

The tendency to call for strict enforcement of security policies assumes that patron behavior is to blame for all security problems. Mast (1983) disagreed with this assumption. She looked at the problem of book theft and mutilation from the standpoint of the sociology of deviance. Mast argued that the control of unwanted behavior can not be achieved by increasing the efficiency of library staff or the use of security technology. Instead, it was put forward that theft and mutilation are terms which are selectively applied to ambiguous events. Librarian's are responsible for much of the security problems in academic libraries because they tend not to prosecute rule violators. Mast believed this is due to the interactional and institutional context of librarianship itself.

Kirkpatrick (1984) studied library criminal activity by looking at two criminological theoretical groupings. One grouping was psychological theories which concentrated on individual traits. The other grouping was sociological theories which examine how societies are structured and how this structuring might cause crime. Both groups can explain library crime but it is difficult to determine if one or both groups accurately explain library crime according to Kirkpatrick.

Responses to Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

Hendrick and Murfin (1974) studied a large academic research library to determine its periodical mutilation rate. They discovered a drop of 23% from a previous study of the same library. Between the studies, an electronic security system had been installed. It was concluded that the security system was having an influence on patron mutilation activity.

The first step in stopping mutilation is to determine the extent of it according to Birney and Williams (1985). The two related historical solutions to the problem such as education and execution (medieval times!). However, Birney and Williams wrote that the first step in any prevention program is to assess what is already mutilated. Librarians first need to know what is being mutilated so that the right steps can be taken to correct the problem.

Atwood and Wall (1990) conducted a periodical mutilation survey that led them to recommend several actions to cut down on the behavior. These included: (1) Providing copy and change machines; (2) Making adequate closing announcements; (3) Replacing mutilated items when possible; (4) Continuing high quality serials management; (5) Displaying signs that explain mutilation is a crime; (6) Purchasing more microform copies; (7) Educating staff; and (8) Patrolling the library.

Constantinou (1995) also conducted a periodical mutilation survey that led her to recommend several actions to cut down on the behavior. These included: (1) Posting signs with warnings about mutilation being a crime; (2) Creating awareness of the problem by utilizing the media; (3) Providing an adequate number of photocopiers and change machines; (4) Announcing library closing times early so that patrons have time to copy; (5) Encouraging faculty to put readings on reserve; and (6) Involving librarians in checking titles for damage.

Several of the studies under the next subheading are relevant to librarian responses to periodical and book mutilation. These included Greenwood and McKean (1985) and Olsen and Ostler (1985). While both of these concentrate on preventing book theft, the points they make about electronic security systems are also true for preventing periodical and book mutilation.

Theft

The Association of Colleges and Research Libraries Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (1994) published guidelines for dealing with theft. The guidelines were divided into what to do before a theft occurred and what to do after it was discovered. Guidelines for preventing theft included: 1. Appointing a staff member as a library security officer; 2. Organizing a security planning committee; 3. Working with campus public relations office; and 4. Establishing contact

with the law enforcement community. Responses to theft included: 1. Notifying the appropriate authorities; 2. Collecting evidence; and 3. Publicizing the theft.

Richards (1979) studied the way that academic institutions treated book thefts. He surveyed academic librarians in 1978 asking them how they responded to book theft among their student patrons. The vast majority did nothing. Richards found a pattern of inaction in the academic library to book theft. Most librarians felt that student understanding of the problem was crucial to ending book theft. Richards discovered that library faculty believed that academic institutions should openly attempt to influence student attitudes to eliminate the problem of book theft.

Greenwood and McKean (1985) examined the effectiveness of electronic security systems. The main library at the University of Kentucky conducted a multiphased project to measure and reduce book loss due to theft. It was found that after installing an electronic security system, book loss rates decreased. However, Greenwood and McKean argued that a manual checking system had some advantages to an electronic security system. Among the reasons were patron deviousness in circumventing security systems and the high cost of electronic surveillance.

Olsen and Ostler (1985) researched academic libraries that had electronic security systems. Twenty-four academic

libraries in the Mountains Plains region of the United States were surveyed to evaluate the effectiveness of electronic security systems. It was found that there were two types of academic libraries using electronic security systems. One group viewed detection systems as a tool to prevent uncirculated items from leaving the library. Another group viewed the system as a means to catch and punish thieves. Olsen and Ostler concluded that those in the second group were more successful in protecting collections.

Winter (1985) examined the design of entrances and exits in Australian academic libraries. Buildings designed with only one exit appeared to be more successful in preventing theft. This was because buildings with few exits were easier to monitor. The conclusion was that future library buildings should have only one main exit. Brand (1980) came to similar conclusions.

Antwi (1989) reported on a study done at the library of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University in Nigeria and how the library dealt with the problem. The study found that students were the most likely class of patrons to steal books from the library. The study also found significant incidences of staff theft. Student and staff residences were searched and many library books were recovered. As a result of the study, the library of Abubakar Tafawa Balewa

tightened security and introduced identification cards to users.

Bahr (1989) listed several ideas for preventing theft from libraries by library employees. These included: (1) Restricting access to rare materials to those who are directly responsible for them; (2) Making detailed inventories of library materials; (3) Insuring all valuable material; and (5) Verifying that all employees are honest by instantly investigating any suspicious behavior.

Antwi (1989) recommended several steps for academic libraries to improve security: (1) A general amnesty week should be instituted to allow stolen books to be returned without penalty; (2) Severe penalties should be brought to bear on offenders such as expulsion for students and dismissal for staff members and faculty; (3) Library training programs should explain to students how harmful the theft of materials is to the library.

Lorenzen (1993) discovered in an Ohio academic library survey that few libraries were prepared for daily security problems. The vast majority of libraries (94%) had no written security policy. Over 42% had no definition at all, written or otherwise. Lorenzen recommended that academic libraries create written security documents to guide library staff.

Despite the problems of security faced by academic libraries, many librarians feel they are doing an excellent

job in preventing security problems. Wurzburger (1988) conducted a survey of academic librarians asking how they felt they were doing in protecting their collections. Nearly every institution reported that theft was low. However, the same librarians believed that security could be improved. Many of the libraries lacked electronic security systems and had small staffs. Despite this, the majority of librarians believed that they were doing an excellent job in preventing theft. Wurzburger found that academic librarians believe that increasing the number of staff was the solution to security concerns such as theft and mutilation.

People

Dealing with difficult and disruptive patrons creates serious problems in libraries. DeRosa (1980) had several steps for dealing with problems patrons who were disruptive. These included; (1) Admonishing the patron; (2) Ordering the patron from the library; (3) Refusing admittance to patron in the future; (4) Communicating with parents if patron was under 18; and (5) getting police or court protection.

Elliott (1982) listed several ways to deal with disturbed patrons. These ideas included: (1) Remaining calm and impersonal with the patron; (2) Setting limits with the patron and sticking to them; (3) Repeating requests to comply with rules or to leave as often as necessary; (4) Refusing to argue with outrageous statements; (5) Offering the patron the option of changing behavior or leaving; (6)

Avoiding humor and personal remarks; (7) Alerting other staff to the problem; and (7) Remaining considerate with the patron.

Another researcher to write about dealing with disturbed patrons was Gothberg (1988). She wrote that having established policies for dealing with problem patrons was important. Gothberg also wrote that having emergency phone numbers close by was crucial for when these disturbances occurred. Finally, Gothberg wrote that librarians needed to develop more assertive behaviors and attitudes.

Summary

Chapter Two provides a review of the literature in which material delves into academic library security. The chapter begins by examining the research into what the security issues of academic libraries are. Next, the literature review examines research into the causes of library security issues. Finally, the chapter examines literature that covers the response of academic libraries to these problems. The next chapter is Chapter Three and it contains an analysis of the literature presented in Chapter Two. The same headings from Chapter Two are utilized in Chapter Three to provide clarity.

CHAPTER THREE

Analysis of the Literature

Introduction

Chapter One includes the problem and purpose of the study which is to examine the security issues of academic libraries. In addition, Chapter One defines terms, discusses limitations and delimitations, and describes the methodology and the organization of the study. Chapter Two contains a review of the literature which includes security issues in academic libraries, causes of security issues in academic libraries, and responses to security issues in academic libraries. Chapter Three provides an analysis of the literature pointing out generalizations, interpretations, and limitations related to the scope of the paper. The same headings used in Chapter Two are utilized in Chapter Three to organize the analysis of the literature.

Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

The mutilation of periodicals and books in academic libraries is extensively documented in library literature. Gouke and Murfin (1980) theorized that academic libraries were the most suspectable kind of library to periodical mutilation. After studying a large academic research library, they discovered a periodical mutilation rate of 9%. They also concluded that an electronic security system would reduce the rate of periodical mutilation. Lorenzen (1993)

surveyed academic libraries in Ohio and discovered a periodical mutilation rate of 2.33%. However, this rate varied by the type of academic library. University libraries had a higher rate of periodical mutilation than seminary libraries. Evidently, while academic libraries are suspectable to periodical mutilation, this varies by type of academic institution. Both of these studies are based on research rather than speculation although the Lorenzen study was the most extensive of the two.

Book mutilation was studied by Taylor (1981). He discovered that books often had words highlighted or underlined. He also was disturbed by editorial comments that appeared in some books left by patrons. Roberts (1984) also studied this but he concluded that a lack of bookmarks caused this problem. This problem shows that even casual browsing of books, if it leaves permanent marks in the book, is viewed as a security problem by some librarians. Neither Taylor or Roberts did much research in this area. Their articles were based on personal observations rather than research.

Theft

Theft of library materials has been documented. Otness and Otness (1988) reported on how valuable map plates were being stolen by thieves from library special collections. The two speculated that most of the theft was done by professional thieves. This is important in that it shows

that some people make their living off of stealing from libraries. These professional thieves appear to target valuable material only such as rare plates. This study surveyed libraries in a large portion of the United States and can be considered to be valid.

O'Neill and Boomgaarden (1995) reported on book deterioration and loss in Ohio Libraries. They found 12% of books were missing. Only 3% of this was due to book deterioration. The two speculated that the rest of the missing books were the result of theft. Libraries spend a lot on the conservation of books. Yet, theft seems to be a bigger problem. This study demonstrates the need for libraries to spend more money on preventing theft. This study included the entire state of Ohio and is very well done.

According to Bahr (1989), some of this theft can be attributed to library employees. Some of the professional thieves described by Otness and Otness may actually work in libraries they steal from. The studies of Bahr and Otness and Otness are a wake up call for libraries if they are considered together.

People

People can disrupt the library and cause a security problem by their behavior. Grof (1984) examined the range of problem patron behavior by looking at drunk patrons, drug addicted patrons, mentally disturbed patrons, and juvenile

delinquent patrons. Grof suggested placing the emphasis on the denial of rights to those using the library without disruption rather than the denial of rights to difficult patrons. Disruptive patrons make it difficult for other patrons to use the library. Hence, the rights of those using the library without disruption are being violated by those who are disrupting the library. Grof concluded it is thus appropriate to deny rights to those who disrupt the rights of others in the library. Grof did not examine the legal consequences of denying rights to disruptive patrons however. While based on personal observations, this article detailed a good philosophical path for librarians to pursue on this topic.

Brashear et al (1981) discovered that public libraries have more problems with inappropriate behavior than do academic libraries. This is not surprising. Although academic libraries are open to the public, fewer patrons use academic libraries than public libraries. Further, academic libraries can restrict access to their collections when it is necessary to do so. Public libraries have to deal with more patron types than do academic libraries and they have more difficulty in restricting access to their collections by the public. This study was conducted throughout the state of Illinois and due to the large sample can be considered valid.

Delph (1980) wrote about preventing public sex in the academic library. Delph noted that certain groups use the library to engage in sexual activities. Libraries often have areas (such as remote stacks and less frequently used restrooms) that are easy to use for sexual activities. These activities inhibit other patrons from fully accessing parts of the library. This is another security problem caused by patron behavior that the librarian needs to be aware of. This article was based on personal observations but Delph's conclusions are still interesting. Delph and Grof seem to agree on placing the emphasis on the rights of those using the library appropriately.

Elliott (1982) wrote about the types of patrons who can cause problems. This list included those with mental problems such as the schizophrenic, the paranoid, and the alcoholic. She also noted criminal types such as exhibitionists, voyeurs, and child molesters. Further, Elliott considered other potentially disturbed patrons such as the elderly, children, and angry people. This article was broad in focus in that virtually every patron is included in a problem patron category. This article was based on personal observation rather than research, although it is still useful for making general categorizations.

Anderson (1986) focused on the patron who harasses library staff without specifically doing anything illegal.

This type of patron can make it difficult for the librarian to help other patrons and to do other aspects of the job. As libraries are open to the public, this type of patron is likely to occur frequently. Again looking to Grof (1984), the solution to the problem is probably placing the emphasis on the rights of patrons rather than the rights of the disturbing patron.

Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

A lot of research has addressed why patrons mutilate periodicals and books. Hendrick and Murfin (1974), Weiss (1981), and Pederson (1990) are examples of this. All three of these studies were based on the results of questionnaires distributed to library patrons asking about their attitudes towards mutilation. Hendrick and Murfin (1974) found that students who mutilated had a less favorable attitude towards the library than non-mutilators. Weiss discovered that the pressure to succeed in a high pressure academic environment causes some patrons to steal and mutilate library material. Pederson (1990) found that student dissatisfaction with library services, a lack of knowledge about replacement costs, a lack of concern for other patrons, and ignorance of what constitutes criminal activity in regards to mutilation can all led to periodical mutilation.

All of the studies in the last paragraph help to shape a picture of the typical mutilator of periodicals in an

academic library. The mutilator has a negative attitude towards the library and is enrolled in a competitive demanding program. Further, the mutilator is dissatisfied with the library, does not know or does not care about replacement costs, does not care about the needs of other patrons, and is not aware that mutilation is a crime.

Collver (1990) examined the mutilation rates of periodicals in academic libraries in relation to student numbers. Collver discovered that mutilation rates in a subject area can be positively predicted from the number of students enrolled in related programs. Further, Schumm (1992) studied the type of periodical most likely to be mutilated. He found that magazines were more likely to be mutilated than journals. This indicates that undergraduates are the main mutilators of periodicals as faculty and graduate students rely primarily on journals.

This allows for the picture of the typical academic periodical mutilator to be broadened further. The typical mutilator is enrolled in a high demand program (Weiss, 1981) that has large enrollment (Collver, 1990). The typical mutilator is also an undergraduate (Schumm, 1992). All of these studies have allowed for a very detailed picture of the academic periodical mutilator to emerge which has proven very helpful in the area of prevention. As all of these studies were based on detailed studies, therefore it can be assumed they are valid.

Theft

There has been research dealing with why people steal from academic libraries. Much of this is closely related to mutilation. Many of the same conclusions about who participates in periodical mutilation apply to those who steal because the two crimes are usually committed by the same patrons. Thus, research on mutilation can be applied to research on theft as well.

Olorunsola (1987) studied the incidents of theft in a Nigerian academic library. He discovered a relationship between theft and the growth rate of the university as a whole. He concluded that rapid growth in the size of a university and in the size of a library collection will result in a sharp increase in security problems such as theft. Many librarians see staffing as the key to preventing security problems (Wurzburger, 1988) and fast growing academic institutions probably do not hire additional staff fast enough to deter security problems.

Watstein (1983) contradicted Hendrick and Murfin (1974) who concluded that the installation of an electronic security system would reduce periodical mutilation rates. Perhaps the span in years between the studies explains this. In 1974, electronic security systems were new. By 1983, patrons had had the time to figure out how to beat them. Hence, theft and mutilation decreased at first. However,

over time, patrons discovered that while theft was hard to get away with, mutilation was easier to accomplish.

People

Both Sheridan (1980) and Mast (1983) showed that librarians are themselves responsible for some security problems. They are not educated as to what security problems are and how they should handle them. Further, librarians do not always enforce rules and punish violators. Lorenzen (1993) found that most libraries do not have written security guidelines. This further supports what Mast and Sheridan believed about library staff.

Sociological theory has been explored to try to determine why patrons cause security problems in libraries. Kirkpatrick (1984) studied library criminal activity by looking at two criminological theoretical groupings. One group of theories focused on individual traits. The other group of theories looked at how societies are structured and how this structuring might cause crime. Kirkpatrick was not sure which group of theories explained library crime better. However, the research of others shows that both theories explain library crime. Weiss (1981) found that a high pressure academic environment can cause some to mutilate which is a sociological theory. Pederson (1990) found that many students just did not care about the needs of others which is a psychological theory.

Responses to Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Mutilation

Several studies have made recommendation for dealing with periodical mutilation in academic libraries. Hendrick and Murfin (1974) discovered that installing an electronic security system will result in a decrease in periodical mutilation. However, a more recent study (Watstein, 1983) contradicted this. Installing an electronic security may cut down on theft but it probably will result in an increase in periodical and book mutilation. Still, mutilated items are preferable to missing items in most instances and the installation of an electronic security system still appears to be a wise decision.

Atwood and Wall (1990) and Constantinou (1995) had several suggestions for cutting down on periodical mutilation. Many of their recommendations centered on patron education on the issue. Other suggestions included simple ideas like making sure there are adequate photocopiers and change machines available and making sure patrons have time to use them. If patrons have the option to photocopy cheaply, many of them will not mutilate periodicals. Birney and Williams (1985) wrote that the first step in mutilation prevention was assessment of what had already been mutilated. Researchers in periodical mutilation have agreed that patron education and assessment are the keys to preventing periodical mutilation.

Theft

Theft of academic library material has also attracted the attention of researchers. The Association of College and Research Libraries Rare Book and Manuscript Section (1994) has published the most comprehensive overview of how to deal with theft in academic libraries. These guidelines covered both what to do before a theft occurred and after a theft occurred. These guidelines stressed heavily educating the public about the problem both before and after the event and communicating with law enforcement officials. Richards (1979) found that library faculty believed that educating the public about the problem was the solution to the problem of book theft. It stands to reason that if the average patron is not familiar with the problem, educating them is a good idea. It also is reasonable to assume that law enforcement officials also do not think about crime in libraries and that communicating with them is a key to recovering lost items.

The effectiveness of electronic security systems was studied by Greenwood and McKean (1985). Book loss decreased after the University of Kentucky installed an electronic security system. However, the two felt that a manual checking system had some advantages over an electronic security system. Greenwood and McKean believed that devious patrons would find ways to get around electronic security systems and that physically checking each person as they

left the library was a superior way of defeating theft. However, it appears that Greenwood and McKean failed to take into account the devious patron. If a devious patron can figure out how to beat an electronic security system, why can not the same patron figure out how to beat a manual checking system?

Olsen and Ostler (1985) found there were two types of academic libraries using electronic security systems. The group that used the systems as a means of punishment were more successful. Again, Mast's (1983) conclusions about the importance of librarians taking firm action against offenders is reinforced.

The design of buildings can help defeat theft attempts in academic libraries. Both Winter (1985) and Brand (1990) discuss the importance of this. The fewer exits a library has the better as far as security issues are concerned. Buildings with few exits are easier to monitor than buildings with numerous exits. This is interesting but it is only useful to those designing new buildings unless librarians in older buildings are willing to close off existing exits.

Antwi (1989) and Schumm (1992) found that students were the most likely class of patrons to steal from the academic library. Antwi also found significant incidents of staff theft. In this Nigerian study, searches were conducted of all student and staff residences to recover lost books.

This would be highly illegal in the United States of America without a court order to search. However, Antwi did discuss the importance of identification cards which would also be helpful in any library if all valid patrons were issued them.

Most libraries do not have any written definition of what a security problem is (Lorenzen, 1993). In Lorenzen's study of academic libraries in Ohio, most did not have a written security policy. It is reasonable to assume those findings could be generalized to other states. As such, it is difficult for many academic libraries in Ohio and beyond to respond to security problems. Again, the findings of Richards (1980) and Mast (1983) are reinforced.

Wurzburger (1988) found that most academic librarians felt they were doing a good job in preventing security problems. Most libraries felt theft was low. They also felt that additional staffing would help cut down on the number of security problems in academic libraries. If Richards (1980) and Mast (1983) are to be believed, this is a false assumption as security problems are worse than most librarians believe.

People

Research has been conducted into ways to control the people who use libraries as well. DeRosa (1980) and Antwi (1989) had several suggestions including the institution of a general amnesty week, enforcing severe penalties, and

library education about the problem. Again, it is interesting that security problems in Nigeria are similar to the problems in the United States of America. Patrons seem to be the same the world over. Elliott (1982) listed ways that library staff could deal with disturbed patrons such as courtesy, firmness, and calmness. Gothberg (1988) stressed having policies to deal with issues as well as developing staff assertiveness.

CHAPTER FOUR

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

Chapter One includes the problem and purpose of the study which is to examine the security issues of academic libraries. In addition, Chapter One defines terms, discusses limitations and delimitations, and describes the methodology and the organization of the study. Chapter Two contains a review of the literature which includes security issues in academic libraries, causes of security issues in academic libraries, and responses to security issues in academic libraries. Chapter Three provides an analysis of the literature pointing out generalizations, interpretations, and limitations related to the scope of the paper. The same headings used in Chapter Two are utilized in Chapter Three to organize the analysis of the literature. Finally, Chapter Four provides a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary

The study examined the problem of security issues of academic libraries. The research questions looked at the following: what type of security problems exist in the libraries of institutions of higher education, what are the causes of the security problems in the libraries of the institutions of higher education, and how are libraries of institutions of higher education dealing with security

problems. The purpose of the study is to discuss an integrated approach to dealing with security issues in academic libraries, both to spare libraries from expensive replacement costs and to protect library patrons.

Security Issues in Academic Libraries

The study begins by pointing out many of the security issues that academic libraries deal with. The mutilation of periodicals, the theft of library materials, and difficult patrons are all reoccurring problems. Academic libraries are the most vulnerable type of library to periodical and book mutilation. Book theft is a larger problem for libraries than book deterioration. Professional thieves are a particular problem because they target special collections of valuable materials. Patrons can also pose problems for an academic library by their behavior which can be obnoxious, harassing, or criminal. Library staff also cause problems by not knowing what security problems are and by not enforcing rules.

Causes of Security Issues in Academic Libraries

A portrait of the periodical mutilator in academic libraries has emerged. The average mutilator is an undergraduate in a high enrollment, high stress program who is unhappy with library services. Further, this patron does not know how expensive it is to replace mutilated material and is not aware that periodical mutilation is a crime.

Finally, this patron does not care about the needs of others.

Theft in an academic library tends to increase as a library and university increase in size. Electronic security systems can decrease theft. However, research has found that electronic security systems increase the level of mutilation at the same time theft decreases.

Several library theorist blame library staff for much of the problems academic libraries have with security issues. This is due both to library staff not being trained properly and not enforcing rules consistently. Patrons may cause security problems for either psychological or sociological reasons.

Responses to Security Issues in Academic Libraries

Academic libraries are taking steps to deal with mutilation and theft. Many are installing electronic security systems, although the results of this are mixed and effectiveness depends on how a library uses the system. Educating patrons about the problems is a recommended solution. It was also found that designing libraries with fewer exits and requiring patrons to have identification cards can cut down on security problems. Difficult patrons have been studied as well and most researchers recommend firmness with these patrons so that the rights of other patrons to use the library are not effected.

Finally, the study looks at how librarians are responding to these issues. Most academic libraries do not have written security policies and library staff have difficulty in identifying and dealing with security issues. Most librarians believe however that they are doing a good job of protecting library collections. Librarians also believe that staffing is the key to solving the issue.

Conclusions

The review of the literature concerning the security issues of academic libraries shows that academic libraries are dealing with several problems. These include the mutilation of periodicals and books, the theft of library material, and handling behavioral problems of patrons. Researchers have looked at the problems, tried to decide what causes them, and attempted to offer solutions.

While there are multiple causes for security problems, studies have shown that most mutilation and theft is done by undergraduates who are in large, difficult programs. These patrons do not understand replacement costs, do not care about the needs of others, and do not know they are committing a crime when they mutilate or steal from the library. Various authors have urged educating this type of patron to cut down on security problems.

It also appears that library staff cause some problems by not knowing what security problems are and how to deal with them. They also do not always enforce the rules

consistently. This problem may be making the security problems worse.

Librarians are taking steps to deal with security issues. They are installing electronic security systems although the effectiveness of these systems is not yet fully known. They are addressing areas such as building design and the use of identification cards as well as trying to deal with problems. Finally, education is being used by some to cope with the issues.

Recommendations

Practice

1. Librarians need to make sure that their libraries have written security policies.

2. Library staff need to be trained to recognize and deal with security problems when they occur.

3. Librarians need to incorporate into patron instruction the importance of not mutilating and stealing in the library.

4. Administrators need to make sure that libraries are staffed properly.

Research

The topic of security issues in academic libraries needs further research.

1. Further research needs to be conducted on the effectiveness of electronic security systems to determine

whether they decrease theft and mutilation and whether they are superior to a manual checking system.

2. Further research needs to be done to determine the extent to which staff are responsible for security issues because they do not know and enforce the rules and whether increasing staff training has any effect on this.

3. Research needs to be conducted to determine the extent to which libraries are educating their patrons on security issues and whether educational programs are effective.

References

Allen, S. (1990). Theft in libraries or archives. College & Research Libraries, 50(10), 939-43.

Anderson, A. J. (1986). The trouble with Larry. Library Journal, 111(11), 45-7.

Antwi, I. K. (July, 1989). The problem of library security: The Bauchi experience. International Library Review, 21, 363-72.

Association of Colleges and Research Libraries Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. (1994). Guidelines regarding thefts in libraries. College & Research Libraries News, 55(11), 641-6.

Association of Colleges and Research Libraries Rare Books and Manuscripts Section. (1989). Guidelines for the security of rare books and other special collections: A draft. College & Research Libraries News, 50,(5), 397-401.

Atwood, T., & Wall, C. (1990). A case study of periodical mutilation in a university serials collection. Library & Archival Security, 10(1), 35-41.

Bahr, A. H. (1989). The thief in our midst. Library & Archival Security, 9(3/4), 77-81.

Birney, A. E., & Williams, S. R. (1985). Mutilation and the folklore of academic librarianship. Library & Archival Security, 7(3/4), 41-7.

Bloom, B. (Fall, 1994). Mutilation of library materials: Campus concerns. New Jersey Libraries, 27, 15-7.

Brand, M. (1984). Security for Libraries: People, Buildings, Collections. Chicago: American Library Association.

Brand, M. (1980). Security of academic library buildings. Library & Archival Security, 3(1), 39-47.

Brashear, J. K., Malone, J. J., & Thorton-Jaringe, J. (1981). Problem patrons: The other kind of library security. Illinois Libraries, 63(4), 343-51.

Collver, M. (1990). Subsequent demand for ripped-off journal articles. The Reference Librarian no. 23/24, 347-66.

Constantinou, C. (1995). Destruction of knowledge: A study of journal mutilation at a large university library. College & Research Libraries, 56(11), 497-507.

Delph, E. D. (1980). Preventing public sex in library settings. Library & Archival Security, 3(2), 17-26.

DeRosa, F. J. (1980). The disruptive patron. Library & Archival Security, 3(3/4), 29-37.

Elliott, J. (1982). Disturbed clients. Unabashed Librarian no. 44, 16-7.

Goldberg, M. (1993). The neverending saga of library theft. Library & Archival Security, 12(1), 87-100.

Gothberg, H. M. (1987). Managing difficult people: Patrons (and others). The Reference Librarian no. 19, 269-84.

Gouke, M. N., & Murfin, M. (September 15, 1980). Periodical mutilation: The insidious disease. Library Journal, 105, 1795-7.

Greenwood, L., & McKean, H. (1985). Effective measurement and reduction of book loss in an academic library. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 11(5), 275-83.

Grof, A. (1984). Crazy Willie revisited. Library Journal,109(16), 1823-4.

Hendrick, C. & Murfin, M. (1975). Ripoffs tell their story: Interviews with mutilators in a university library. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 1(1), 8-12.

Hendrick, C. & Murfin, M. (1974). Project library ripoff: A study of periodical mutilation in a university library. College & Research Libraries, 35(6), 402-4.

Hines, T. (1975). Theft, mutilation, and loss-to-use ratio. Library Security Newsletter, 1(3), 1-4.

Kirkpatrick, J. T. (1984). Explaining crime and disorder in libraries. Library Trends, 3(1), 13-28.

Lincoln, A. J. (1984). Crime in the Library: A Study of Patterns, Impact, and Security. New York: Bowker.

Lily, R. (1991). Ripoffs revisited: Periodical mutilation in a university research library. Library & Archival Security, 11(1), 43-70.

Lincoln, A. J., & Lincoln, C. Z. (1986). Library crime and security: An international perspective. Library & Archival Security, 8(1/2), 14-7.

Lorenzen, M. (1993). Security Problems of Ohio Academic Libraries. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 367341.

Luke, J. M. (1991). The mutilation of periodicals in a mid-size university library. The Serials Librarian, 20, 95-109.

Martin, R. (January, 1973). Microforms and periodicals mutilation. Microform Review, 2, 6-8.

Mast, S. (1983). Ripping off and ripping out: Book theft and mutilation from academic libraries. Library & Archival Security, 5(4), 31-51.

Msuya, J. (1991). Serials mutilation hazard at the University of Dar es Salaam Library in Tanzania. Library & Archival Security, 11(1), 109-16.

Obiagwu, M. C. (December, 1992). Library abuse in academic institutions: A comparative study of University of Port Harcourt in Nigeria and King Fahad University of Petroleum and Minerals in Saudi Arabia. International Information & Library Review, 24, 291-305.

Olorunsola, R. (1987). Crimes in academic libraries: University of Ilorin library experience. Library Scientist, 14, 29-43.

Olsen, R. J., & Ostler, L. J. (1985). Get tough on theft: Electronic theft detection. Library & Archival Security, 7(3/4), 67-77.

Okoye-Ikonta, G. I. (1981). Book thefts and mutilation in Nigerian university libraries. Library Scientist, 8, 89-100.

O'Neill, E. T., & Boomgaarden, W. L. (1995). Book deterioration and loss: Magnitude and characteristics in Ohio libraries. Library Resources & Technical Services, 39(4), 394-408.

Otness, H. M., & Otness, H. (August, 1988). Going plating-Stealing maps from libraries. Western Association of Map Libraries Information Bulletin, 19, 206-10.

Pedersen, T. L. (1990). Theft and mutilation of library materials. College & Research Libraries, 51(3), 120-8.

Pinzelik, B. P. (1984). Monitoring book losses in an academic library. Library & Archival Security, 6(4), 1-12.

Ragains, P. (1991). Availability and mutilation of U.S. Geological Survey publications: An analytic study at Montana State University. The Reference Librarian, no. 32, 247-57.

Richards, J. H. (1979). Missing in action. Journal of Academic Librarianship, 5(5), 266-9.

Richards, S., & Lister, L. (1991). An Exploration of Vandalism/Food/Drink Issue in Academic Libraries. Emporia, Kansas: Kaleidoscope Emporia State University Press.

Roberts, F. X. (March 14, 1994). Bookmarks and the abuse of books. AB Bookman's Weekly, 93, 1125-6+.

Sampson, K. J. (1982). Disturbed and disturbing patrons: Handling the problem patron. Nebraska Library Association Quarterly, 13(1), 9-11.

Schumm, R. W. (1994). Periodical mutilation revisited: A two-year follow up study. The Serials Librarian, 25(1/2), 1-6.

Schumm, R. W. (1992). Patterns of periodical mutilation at three academic libraries. Serials Librarian, 21(4), 147-56.

Seleth, J. P. (1991). The objects of his devotion: G. D. Chesire, bibliophile and book thief. College & Research Libraries News, 52(11), 712-5.

Sheridan, L. W. (1980). People in libraries as security agents. Library & Archival Security, 3(1), 57-61.

Smith, F. E. (1984). Supplementary deterrents in library security. Library & Archival Security, 6(1), 49-57.

Smith, F. E. (1984). Questionable strategies in library security studies. Library & Archival Security, 6(3), 43-53.

Stuart, M. (Fall, 1988). The crime of Dr. Pilcher: A scholar-biblioklept in imperial Russia and his European predecessors. Libraries & Culture, 23, 401-26.

Taylor, D. (1981). Enemies of books. College & Research Libraries News, 42(9), 317-9.

Trinkaus-Randall, G. (1989). Preserving special collections through internal security. College & Research Libraries, 50(7), 448-54.

Van Nort, S. (1994). Archival and library theft: The problem that will not go away. Library & Archival Security, 12(2), 25-49.

Varner, C. (1983). Journal mutilation in academic libraries. Library & Archival Security, 5(4), 19-29.

Varner, C. (1983). The Causes, Measurements,and Prevention of Journal Mutilation in an Academic Library. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, no. ED 234817.

Wall, C. (1985) Inventory what you might expect to be missing. Library & Archival Security, 7(2), 27.

Watstein, S. B. (1983). Book mutilation: An unwelcome by-product of electronic security systems. Library & Archival Security, 5(1), 11-33.

Weiss, D. (1981). Book theft and mutilation in a large urban university library. College & Research Libraries, 42(4), 341-7.

Winter, K. (1985). Entrance/exit design of Australian academic libraries since 1959. Australian College Libraries, 3(4), 167-75.

Wurzburger, M. (Spring, 1988). Current security practices in college and university special collections. Rare Books & Manuscript Librarianship, 3, 43-57.